

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-14 and 16-30 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 is independent and has been amended. Applicant submits that all presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14 and 16-30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,437,818 to Ludwig et al., (hereinafter “Ludwig”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,334,017 to Hawkes, Rycharde Jeffery et al., (hereinafter “Hawkes”). Applicant submits that the combination of Ludwig and Hawks fails to disclose or suggest each of the features recited in amended claim 1.

Claim 1, as amended, recites, in part “the multimedia collaboration system configured to...select an appropriate endpoint address of the plurality of endpoint addresses assigned to the participant from the participant’s client device in response to a request to join the multimedia collaboration session, the network and the media type, the plurality endpoint addresses being assigned priorities; and automatically attempt to connect to at least one client device and an associated endpoint at the selected end point address based on a priority assigned to the end point.” Applicant submits that Ludwig and Hawkes fails to disclose the above-noted features of amended claim 1.

Column 19, lines 47-59 of Ludwig discloses a collaboration session initiation procedure that includes the “collaboration initiator” contacting directory services 66 for address information for the selected participants. The process of obtaining address information from directory services 66 does not support obtaining endpoint addresses from a client device. The addresses are obtained from a centralized directory service database and not a client device. Additionally, the addresses disclosed in Ludwig are not selected as an appropriate endpoint address of a plurality of endpoint addresses assigned to the participant. Addresses are obtained in Ludwig solely to satisfy the need to match addresses with designated “participants” (see column 19, line 57 of Ludwig). The

plurality of addresses being assigned to the participant and the selection of one of those addresses in response to a request to join a session is beyond the scope of Ludwig.

Columns 21 and 22 of Ludwig also fail to provide support for the above-noted features of claim 1. The bottom of column 21 discloses a two-party call being setup, and column 22 discloses a caller initiating a call by selecting a call recipient. The collaboration initiator then requests a user's address from the directory service 66. The initiator then requests a video call to the caller with the address. There is no disclosure of any endpoint address being selected from among a plurality of endpoint addresses assigned to the participant's client device. There is also no support for the endpoint addresses being assigned priorities.

The only disclosure of a priority in Ludwig's disclosure is regarding a priority request that is sent to add a new caller to an ongoing teleconference (see column 37, lines 55 and 56 of Ludwig), and, priority calls 261-263 being received during a teleconference. Ludwig discloses that an important call is a priority type of call, and that a request may also have a corresponding priority. However, Ludwig does not disclose that this priority has any nexus with any endpoint address, or, assigning a priority to an endpoint address. As disclosed in Ludwig, the urgency of a call or a request priority is not comparable to the features recited in claim 1, such as, designated user endpoint address priorities.

Furthermore, since Ludwig does not associate priorities with addresses then Ludwig certainly does not disclose "automatically attempt to connect to at least one client device and an associated endpoint at the selected end point address based on a priority assigned to the end point", as recited in claim 1. In fact, Ludwig's disclosure teaches away from the features recited in claim 1 as Ludwig's "priority" calls received still require the expert to quickly wind down and conclude his call to answer the high priority calls received (see column 38, lines 50-55 of Ludwig). Conversely, claim 1 recites an automatic "attempt to connect...based on the priority assigned to the endpoint." The expert example disclosed in columns 35 and 37 of Ludwig does not disclose any priority assigned to an endpoint and also does not disclose any automatic call connecting based on the priority.

With regards to Hawkes, although Hawkes discloses a web interaction system which allows considerable flexibility in how a request from a user to communicate with one or more other participants is satisfied based on the user's devices capabilities, preference, priority and network topology, it does not disclose the specific operation of selecting an appropriate endpoint address of the plurality of endpoint addresses assigned to the participant as discussed above. Furthermore, Hawkes does not disclose any endpoint addresses that are assigned priorities.

Although Hawkes discloses automatically inviting participants to the session, it does not disclose automatically connecting to the end points based on a priority assigned to them. In the instant application, continuing the teleconferencing example, once the endpoint addresses of the endpoints (mobile phone, fixed line phone etc.) have been selected, an attempt is made to connect to the end points based on the priorities assigned to them. If a participant has set a higher priority to the mobile phone, an attempt will first be made to connect to the mobile phone. An attempt to connect to the fixed line phone may be made only if the connection with the mobile phone is unsuccessful.

Ludwig and Hawkes, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1 and the differences between the claimed subject matter of claim 1 and the cited art are significant and were non-obvious, at the time the invention was made, to a person having ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is non-obvious over the combined teachings of Ludwig and Hawkes. Each of the dependent claims 2-14 and 16-30 properly depend (either directly or indirectly) upon amended independent claim 1 and are deemed to include the same limitations as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, at least for the reasons articulated above, claims 2-14 and 16-30 are non-obvious over the combined teachings of Ludwig and Hawkes. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/776,459
Amendment dated 12/17/2010
Reply to Office Action of 09/17/2010

Conclusion

For the reasons described above, Applicant respectfully believes the current independent claim, as well as the claims that depend from it, are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that they be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 17, 2010

By: /Raffi Gostanian/
Raffi Gostanian
Reg. No. 42,595
Tel: (972) 849-1310